

## **Crescent Springs Small Area Study**

Task Force Meeting Minutes

Location: NKAPC Commission Chambers

Tuesday, December 16, 2009, 6:00 – 7:30 P.M.

### **ATTENDANCE:**

Bobbie Baker – Crescent Springs Resident Residing within Study Area  
Joe Baker – Crescent Springs City Attorney  
Jim Collett – Mayor of Crescent Springs  
Eric Haaser – Crescent Springs Resident  
Dawn Johnson – Crescent Springs Resident  
Louis Prabell – Crescent Springs Resident  
George Ripberger – Crescent Springs City Employee  
Mark Rogge – Crescent Springs Resident / KCPC Representative  
Scott Santangelo – Crescent Springs City Council Member  
Scott Siefke – Co-owner of Crescent Springs Business within Study Area  
Tom Vergamini – Crescent Springs City Council Member  
Edward Dietrich – NKAPC – Project Manager  
James Fausz – NKAPC

### **ABSENT:**

Ben Bratton – Local Resident  
Bobby Chipman – Crescent Springs Resident Residing Within Study Area  
Barrie Creamer – Crescent Springs Resident Residing within Study Area  
Matthew Damon – Crescent Springs Resident / Student at Villa Madonna Academy  
Andy Eisner – Crescent Springs Resident  
Matthew Johnson – Crescent Springs Resident / Student at Covington Latin  
Daniele Longo – Crescent Springs Resident  
Bob Mueller – Crescent Springs Resident  
Greg Sketch – Crescent Springs Resident  
Bill Toebben – Owner of Crescent Springs Business within Study Area

## **1. DESIGN GUIDELINES**

Mr. Dietrich began the meeting by introducing the concept of design guidelines. He reminded the task force that the study area is the entry way into the city and forms the foundation of people's first impressions of Crescent Springs. He explained that each different land use (commercial retail, mixed use, and industrial) could utilize different criteria for their respective design guidelines. He also indicated the guidelines would help serve as a basis for future zoning regulations, which would be developed after the planning study was complete. He then displayed some examples of design guidelines in use by showing site plans for other developments.

### ***a. Streetscape***

Mr. Dietrich next discussed ideas pertaining to streetscapes in the study area. He elaborated by saying streetscape could encompass the following features:

- Cross-section (width of street/lanes, number of lanes, design features such as medians, etc.) extend from edge of parking to edge of parking or building face to building face.

- Location and size of sidewalks
- Landscaping along the streets
- Street lights and furniture
- Underground utilities
- Pedestrian friendly with drive thru (shared access, clear visibility, etc)
- Landscape walkway to pedestrian railroad crossing

Mr. Dietrich also displayed several images of cross sections, sidewalk types, landscaping, lighting and street furniture to better illustrate the components of streetscaping.

Chairperson Vergamini questioned whether these guidelines would be bound by current subdivision regulations. Mr. Dietrich said he would check into the specifics before the next task force meeting.

Mr. Siefke asked how utilities would be transitioned to underground placement. Mr. Dietrich stated that it would be unlikely that burying utilities would happen all at once. He mentioned the importance of including text in the zoning code that would require underground utilities. Mr. Fausz mentioned that additional costs of burying utilities would not be covered by the utility company and would have to be offset by some other funding source. Mr. Dietrich also indicated that Duke Energy would likely be reluctant to bury the utilities along Ritche because the wires constitute a major trunk line in their utility network.

#### ***b. Parking***

Mr. Dietrich continued the design guideline discussion by addressing parking. He mentioned that parking guidelines could include the following ideas:

- Location of parking
- Amount of parking (including size of spaces, distribution between front, side and rear of building, distance between street and building, etc.)
- Landscaping of parking lots

He next presented images to detail location of parking and parking lots that utilized landscaping in their layout. He mentioned that landscaping could also be implemented to reduce the amount of stormwater runoff through green infrastructure.

Mayor Collett asked if provisions allowing underground parking could be included in the guidelines. Mr. Dietrich said underground parking could be included as a possibility. He also indicated that underground parking costs roughly two to four times the amount of a parking structure and was among the highest priced parking option available.

#### ***c. Buildings***

Mr. Dietrich proceeded to discuss design guidelines that pertained specifically to buildings. He discussed points such as:

- Location of building (proximity to street, etc.)
- Height of building
- Building size / footprint size
- Exterior materials
- Fenestration / window ratios

- Roof designs
- Breakup of the building's street wall
- Franchise/formula buildings (McDonald's, Walgreens, Arby's, etc.)

He presented images that illustrated ideas related to the location of buildings, amount of windows in a building, exterior design, and how different façade guidelines could affect the look of formula buildings.

Mr. Dietrich asked the task force if they wanted to allow one story buildings in the study area. Ms. Baker mentioned she liked the idea of multiple stories with mixed uses in the buildings.

Mr. Ripberger questioned what would happen if smaller pieces of land were left over after larger developments were implemented. He was concerned that footprint and building size regulations would prohibit the smaller parcels from being developed. Mr. Dietrich explained the real limiting factor would be the total amount of square footage that was constructed in the zone. Vice Chairperson Santangelo added the development would be set based on who built in the area first. Mr. Dietrich added the only way to have the area develop in the most ideal way would be if one developer purchased the entire area and redeveloped it as one cohesive improvement.

The Task Force also discussed the potential for having different requirements for building locations depending on the building's land use.

Chairperson Vergamini commented that adding guidelines would add costs for property developers. Mr. Dietrich agreed the building would cost more, but guidelines might discourage construction of the cheapest product possible. He added that while some developers might be deterred by the added costs, others would be willing to pay the higher prices so they could be in the marketplace. Mr. Siefke continued by saying the City should focus on "selling" the area and concepts the Task Force envisions to developers, not "buying" the first proposal a developer presents to the city.

#### ***d. Gateway, Signage, and Wayfinding***

Mr. Dietrich next discussed ideas related to how people find businesses in the study area. He covered the following topics:

- Entryway (city name, salutation)
- Pole signs (height, location, total number)
- Monument signs
- Signs on buildings
- Multi-vendor signs
- Wayfinding outside of study area
- Wayfinding within study area

He also displayed photographs of different gateway signs, multivendor signs, monument signs, wayfinding along the Interstate, and city-wide wayfinding systems.

Mr. Siefke questioned whether or not removing the high signs would be detrimental to fast food owners. Chairperson Vergamini commented that just because these signs were allowed in the 1950s and 60s doesn't mean they're appropriate for today. Task Force discussion on the topic centered around the idea of transitioning to the blue wayfinding signs found along the Interstate.

***e. Green Infrastructure***

Mr. Dietrich finished the discussion of design guidelines by presenting green infrastructure ideas. He presented the following ideas:

- Green Building design
- Stormwater management
- Tree Canopy
- Pervious surfaces
- Vegetation buffer along RR and Interstate

He illustrated topics including green buildings and permeable pavements. He also informed the Task Force that individual developers would be responsible for stormwater that their site creates.

Ms. Johnson questioned who would pay for maintenance costs associated with green infrastructure practices. Mr. Dietrich answered that native plants requiring little maintenance are generally installed to mitigate stormwater. He also described that any maintenance costs would be more than offset by the savings incurred by not having to install gray infrastructure and through a reduced stormwater fee.

**4. WRAP UP**

Mr. Dietrich asked the Task Force to review the overall concepts that were presented before the next meeting and be prepared to make a decision on the level of design guidelines they wished to see in the plan. After some discussion Mr. Dietrich said he would send out a request to the Task Force members for design guideline recommendations, this email would include examples. He recommended emailing the group by hitting “reply all” so that everyone could be included in the conversation.

Mr. Dietrich reminded the task force the next meeting date is January 27, 2010 at 6:00 p.m. The meeting ended at approximately 7:45 p.m.